REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 52-53 and 56-77. Claims 54 and 55, which the Examiner has indicated contain allowable subject matter, have been rewritten in independent claim format by rewriting claim 54 as new independent claim 77, including the subject matter of claim 52 on which claim 54 depended, and by rewriting claim 55 as new independent claim 76. Accordingly, claims 54 and 55 have been canceled. Claims 52-53, 57-67, and 72 have been amended to depend on new claim 76. In addition, new claim 75 has been added which combines claim 63 with previous claim 51 rather than claim 54. Accordingly, claim 51 has been canceled. Claims 53 and 60-67 have also been amended to improve their form, to provide antecedent basis, or to correct a clerical error noted therein. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of a telephone interview on December 1 and 3, 2004, the substance of which is recorded herein.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner had objected to claims 51-74 because of the characterization of component (d2) in main claim 51 as this component could no longer have more than

one silicon-bound alkoxy group. Therefore, the Examiner requested that the phrase "at least one" Si-OR structural unit should be removed from the two places where it appeared in the claim.

In addition, claims 51-53, 56-60, 64 and 67-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by King et al U.S.

Patent No. 5,696,209. Claims 69-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over King et al. Claims 61, 65 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al in view of Lutz et al U.S. Patent No. 6,201,055.

The Examiner also indicated, however, that claims 54-55 and 62-63 contained allowable subject matter, and would be allowable over the prior art if rewritten in independent form including all the limitation of the base claims and any intervening claims.

In the interview on December 1, 2004, Applicants' attorney inquired as to whether a claim combining the subject matter of claim 63 with 51 instead of claim 54 would be allowable along with the other claims considered allowable by the Examiner.

During the interview on December 3, 2004, the Examiner advised

that such a claim would be allowable over the prior art, but that sufficient antecedent basis should be provided in the claim for the inert carrier materials recited in claim 63.

In response, in order to expedite the proceedings, Applicants have rewritten claim 54 in indepedent form as new claim 77 incorporating the subject matter of claims 54 and 52 on which claim 54 depended, have rewritten claim 55 in independent claim form as new claim 76, have amended claims 52-53, 57-67, and 72 to depend on new claim 76, have canceled claims 51, 54 and 55, and have added new claim 75 incorporating the recitation regarding the carrier materials previously appearing in claim 63 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable during the telephone interview. Applicants have also removed the phrase "at least one" with respect to component (d2) in new claim 77, and have affirmatively recited the carrier materials as component (f) in new claim 75. Accordingly, new independent claims 75, 76 and 77 are believed to be in condition for allowance. As all remaining dependent claims 52-53 and 56-74 depend directly or indirectly on new claim 76, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance as well.

In summary, claims 52, 53, 56-67 and 72 have been amended, claims 51, 54 and 55 have been canceled, and new claims 75-77 have been added. In view of the foregoing withdrawal of the final Action and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

ALEXANDER BUBLEWITZ ET (CIR) (RCE)

Allison C. Collard, Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg. No. 29, 298

Reg. No. 22, 532

Attorneys for Applicant

COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 Northern Boulevard

Roslyn, New York 11576 (516) 365-9802

FJD:jc

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 16, 2004.

Ingrid Mittendorf

R:\Patents\B\BUBLEWITZ ET AL.-6 (CIP)(RCE)\AMENDMENT - FINAL.wpd